



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,516	07/09/1999	SHELL S. SIMPSON	10982057-1	8257

22879 7590 07/14/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRAN, DOUGLAS Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

B

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/350,516

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas Q. Tran

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,11-14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,11-14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7,15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11-14, 16, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Bauer et al. (US Patent No. 5,819,047) and Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083).

As to claim 1, Bauer teaches a method for printing a document accessible by a server (21e in fig. 2), comprising:

creating on the server an original receipt (i.e., quotas ) for the document (col. 3, lines 49-52);

providing at least one page of the document from the server to a print job agent (i.e., a PC 22e in fig. 2);

updating the original receipt (i.e., the consumption information is updated) to indicate the at least one page of the document was provided to the print job agent (col. 5, lines 24-25);

communicating the at least one page of the document from the print job agent to an output device (col. 5, lines 3-4);

printing the at least one page of the document using the output device (col. 5, lines 3-4);

Art Unit: 2624

However, Bauer does not teach copying the original receipt to the print job agent; and updating the copy of the receipt to indicate the document was printed.

Savitzky teaches communicating and transmitting the document from the server to the computer of the client and updating the original receipt to indicate the document was provided to the client (col. 10, lines 36-44).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the computer in Bauer for receiving the document and the copy of transaction as taught by Savitzky. The suggestion for modifying the printing system of Bauer can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Savitzky because a modified system of Bauer is not only receiving the requested document for printing from a network server but also receiving the copy of transaction from the network server.

As to claim 3, Bauer teaches that before providing the at least one portion of the document from the server to the job agent, the print job agent requesting the at least one portion of the document (col. 4, lines 65-66).

As to claim 4, Bauer teaches that uniquely identifying the output device to the server (col. 4, lines 65-66).

As to claim 5, Bauer teaches that uniquely identifying the output device to the server includes conveying a serial number of the output device to the server (fig. 2 indicates: printers 23s locates from the network. Thus, any printer in the network has a serial number to the server).

As to claim 6, Savitzky teaches that the server (i.e., web scanner) encrypts the document (col. 14, lines 24-26) and the print job agent decrypting the encrypted document from the server

Art Unit: 2624

(note that the client would decrypt the received document if the document is encrypted from a server).

As to claim 8, Savitzky teaches that including the server communicating a symmetric key to the output device and wherein the server encrypting the at least one portion of the document includes the server using the symmetric key to encrypt the document (the document is HTML format 'in col. 14, line 19' and the communication between the input device and output device is used HTTP protocol 'in col. 14, lines 20-21'. Therefore, the server used HTTP GET, PUT or POST commands as keys for encrypting the document 'in col. 14, lines 20-22').

As to claim 9, and 11-14 and 16, the combination of Bauer and Savitzky teaches apparatus claims for performing the method claims 1, 3-6 and 8 as indicated above.

As to claims 17, and 19-20, the combination of Bauer and Savitzky teaches program for instructing the method claims 1, 4 and 6 as indicated above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 7, 15 are objected.

Claims 7 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims 1 and 9 respectively, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claims 7 and 15, the prior art, taken either singly or in combination, does not teach the method and the means for "uniquely identifying the output device to the server and the server obtaining a device specific public key for the output device; and wherein the server encrypting

Art Unit: 2624

the at least one page of the document includes the server using the public key to encrypt the at least one page of the document”.

***Response to Arguments and Amendment***

Applicant's arguments filed 5/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserted in page 2 that “Bauer does not disclose the quotas or quota limits being a receipt for a document “. In reply, Bauer clearly teaches FIG. 5 shows a flow diagram 50 illustrating control of resource usage according to the present invention. A user at a PC 22e desire consume disk storage space on disk drive 25e by copying a file at step 51. At step 52, the file system queries the accounts database for determining whether the resource request exceeds the storage quota assigned to the user identity for the user. If, at step 53, the storage quota has not been exceeded, the operation is authorized and the file is copied at step 54. The consumption information for the user identity is updated accordingly at step 55. If the storage quota has been exceeded at step 53, the consumption is denied and the operation fails at step 56.

Applicant asserted in page 3 that “together Bauer and Savitsky do not disclose an original receipt which is copied to a print job agent and updated to indicate a page of a document was printed.” In reply, Bauer clearly teaches Checking with the authority for resource consumption authorization at the time the resource is requested to be consumed allows, for this example, printing of the first fifty page file and then denies printing of the next two print requests

Art Unit: 2624

because the appropriate network-wide quota for the network identity is updated after the first request for resource consumption is complete (col. 5, lines 6-15);

Furthermore, Bauer teaches the network-wide maximum-use quota for the resource that is associated with the user is compared to a network-wide resource amount that is in-use by the user. If the limits are not exceeded, then the requested resource is allocated to the user for consumption and the information relating to network-wide resource amount that is in-use or consumed by the user identity is updated when the consumption is complete. If it is determined that the quota has been exceeded, the user is denied consumption of the resource.

Savitsky further teaches communicating and transmitting the document from the server to the computer of the client and updating the original receipt to indicate the document was provided to the client (col. 10, lines 36-44). Therefore, the teaching of Savitsky would modify the deficiency of Bauer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the cited prior art fully discloses the claimed invention and the rejection stand.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**


Art Unit: 2624

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran  
July 12, 2004



**GABRIEL GARCIA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**